

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed July 19, 2004 (Paper No. 22). Upon entry of this response, claims 38, 39, and 51-60 are pending in the application. In this response, claims 38 and 51 have been amended, claims 53-60 have been added, and claims 37 and 50 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully request that the amendments being filed herewith be entered and request that there be reconsideration of all pending claims.

1. Rejection of Claims 35-39 and 50-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 35-39 and 50-52 have been rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over *Boyce et al.* (U.S. 5,614,952) in view of *Kaira et al.* (U.S. 5,955,506). Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been overcome by the claim amendments made herein, or have been rendered moot by claim cancellation. It is well established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1551 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

a. Claims 37 and 50

Claims 37 and 50 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and the rejection is therefore rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. Applicants take this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these cancelled claims in a continuing

application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate any of the cancelled subject matter to the public.

b. Claims 38 and 51

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 38, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that the proposed combination of *Boyce et al.* in view of *Kaira et al.* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of “retrieving a first set of video data from a memory component, wherein the memory component stores compressed video data and decompressed video data, wherein the first set of video data corresponds to a first video picture; transmitting the second set of video data to a display device, wherein the second set of video data is not stored in the memory component prior to being transmitted.” Furthermore, claim 51, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that the proposed combination of *Boyce et al.* in view of *Kaira et al.* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of “a system configured to...retrieve a first set of video data from a memory component, wherein the memory component stores compressed video data and decompressed video data, wherein the first set of video data corresponds to a first video picture; transmit the second set of video data to a display device, wherein the second set of video data is not stored in the memory component prior to being transmitted.”

Boyce et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest using at least the above-recited features. *Boyce et al.* discloses, at most, a video decoder 100 including a preparser 112, a syntax parser/variable length decoder (VLD) 120, a downampler 126, a memory circuit 114, and various other components. Memory circuit 114 includes coded data buffer 116 and frame buffer 118. Preparser 112 discards some of input variable-length encoded data before storing the remainder in coded data buffer 116, and the VLD 120 operates on the data in coded data buffer

116. (Col. 5, lines 55-57). Downampler 126 operates on decoded data produced by VLD 120, and this output is stored in frame buffer 118. (FIG. 3.)

The Office Action alleges that coded data buffer 116 corresponds to “retrieving a first set of video data from a memory component.” The Office Action further alleges that *Boyce et al.* discloses “the second set of video data is not stored in the memory component” (116). The reasoning behind this allegation appears to be that FIG. 3 shows the down-sampled data being stored in frame buffer 118, rather than in coded data buffer 116, before being provided to a display.

Applicants have amended claims 38 and 51 to be independent claims. Applicants have further amended claims 38 and 51 to recite “*wherein the memory component stores compressed video data and decompressed video data.*” FIG. 3 of *Boyce et al.* shows that memory circuit 114 includes coded data buffer 116 and frame buffer 118. FIG. 3 further teaches that the down-sampled data is stored in frame buffer 118 before outputting to a display, and frame buffer 118 is included in memory circuit 114. Applicants respectfully assert that *Boyce et al.* therefore teaches storing the downsampled video in the same buffer used to store coded video, and does not teach “transmitting the second set of video data to a display device, wherein the second set of video data is not stored in the memory component prior to being transmitted” as recited in amended claim 38, or “a system configured to...transmit the second set of video data to a display device, wherein the second set of video data is not stored in the memory component prior to being transmitted” as recited in amended claim 51.

Kaira et al. also fails to teach, suggest or disclose the above-described features of amended claims 38 and 51. Accordingly, the proposed combination of *Boyce et al.* in view of *Kaira et al.* does not teach at least the above-described features as recited in amended claims 38

and 51. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 38 and 51 overcome the rejection, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

c. Claims 39 and 52

Since amended claims 38 and 51 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 39 and 52 are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1616, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 39 and 52 be withdrawn.

2. New Claims

Applicants submit that no new matter has been added in the new claims 53-60 and that new claims 53-60 are allowable over the cited references. Specifically, independent claim 53 is allowable for at least the reason that none of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggest “responsive to determining that the resource-constrained mode is to be initiated, initiating the resource-constrained mode, including foregoing decoding of a first set of compressed pictures, each of the first set of pictures being at a first spatial resolution; retrieving, from a memory component, a second set of compressed pictures; storing, in the memory component, a third set of decoded pictures corresponding to the second set of compressed pictures, each of the third set of pictures being at the first spatial resolution.” Independent claim 54 is allowable for at least the reason that none of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggest “responsive to determining that the resource-constrained mode is to be initiated, initiate the resource-constrained mode, including foregoing decoding of a first set of compressed pictures, each of the first set of pictures being at a first spatial resolution; retrieve, from a memory component, a second set of

compressed pictures; store, in the memory component, a third set of decoded pictures corresponding to the second set of compressed pictures, each of the third set of pictures being at the first spatial resolution.”

Independent claim 55 is allowable for at least the reason that none of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggest “receiving, in a memory component, video data including a first set of video data and a second set of video data, the first set comprising a first complete picture and the second set comprising a second complete picture; …responsive to determining that the resource-constrained mode is to be initiated, initiating the resource-constrained mode, including foregoing decoding of the second set of video data.” Independent claim 58 is allowable for at least the reason that none of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggest “receive, in a memory component, video data including a first set of video data and a second set of video data, the first set comprising a first complete picture and the second set comprising a second complete picture; …responsive to determining that the resource-constrained mode is to be initiated, initiate the resource-constrained mode, including foregoing decoding of the second set of video data.”

Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner enter and allow the above new claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and presently pending claims 38, 39, and 51-60 be allowed to issue. Although some dependent claim rejections and some obviousness rejections are explicitly addressed above, the omission of arguments for other claims is not intended to be construed as an implied admission that the Applicants agree with the rejection or finding of obviousness for the respective claim or claims. Although some dependent claim rejections and some obviousness rejections are explicitly addressed above, the omission of arguments for other claims is not intended to be construed as an implied admission that Applicants agree with the rejection or finding of obviousness for the respective claim or claims. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER
& RISLEY, L.L.P.**

By:

Jeffrey R. Kuester, Reg. No. 34,367

100 Galleria Parkway, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-6148
Tel: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933